

Application No. 10/644,043

Reply to Office Action

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Summary of the Application

Claims 1-55 are currently pending in the application. In this response, Applicant has amended claims in a manner to clarify the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention, and added several new claims. No new matter has been introduced into the application by way of this amendment.

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 14-18, 23-27, 32-36 and 41-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to their inclusion of the term "second" therein.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,919,402 to Murphy et al. ("Murphy").

Claims 2, 4 and 6-9 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Finally, claims 10-13, 19-22, 28-31 and 37-40 are allowed.

Discussion

Applicant has amended claims 14-18, 23-27, 32-36 and 41-45 in order to clarify the claims and address the Section 112 rejection. Other claims are also amended to address grammatical matters.

In addition, Applicant has rendered claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9 independent via amended claim 2, new claim 46, amended claim 6, new claim 48 and new claim 52, respectively, with amended claim 3 and new claims 47, 49-51 and 53-55 dependent thereon. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2-4 and 6-55 are in condition for allowance.

Turning to the substantive rejection, Applicant submits that Murphy does not disclose, nor motivate one skilled in the art to prepare, the subject matter described in claims 1 and 5 (claim 3 being allowable due to its dependence on claim 2).

The passage in Murphy relied upon in the Office Action refers to a conductive metal pattern being formed on top of a black conductive pattern produced by the polymerization of a solution of pyrrole:electron acceptor, the acceptor being selected from the group consisting of silver salts and being present in sub-stoichiometric amounts. Any silver particles present

Application No. 10/644,043

Reply to Office Action

in the photopolymerized polypyrrole layer will be homogeneously distributed throughout. This stands distinct contrast to the claimed invention, which requires a layer comprising an intrinsically conductive polymer and a conductive metal non-uniformly distributed therein and forming of itself a conductive entity. Claims 1 and 5 are, therefore, allowable over Murphy for this reason alone. Moreover, these claims further require, among other limitations, the conductive layer to be substantially transparent, which is distinguishable over Murphy, the latter providing layers produced by the photopolymerization process described therein that are black, i.e., non-transparent. The claims are thus also patentable over Murphy on this basis.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the application is in proper condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Griffith, Reg. No. 33,392
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: January 12, 2006